

**C. REMARKS****Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-25 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, 14, and 21-25 are independent claims. Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-14, 18-19, and 21-25 have been amended, claims 4, 11, and 17 have been canceled, and no claims have been added.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicant notes with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicant's representative, the Examiner, and the Primary Examiner on May 11, 2006. During the telephonic interview, Applicant's representative, the Examiner, and the Primary Examiner discussed one of the 103 references (Slutsman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,604,129). In particular, Applicant's representative discussed that Applicant's invention claims a method for a computer system to determine and change a second agenda item's attributes in response to adjusting a first agenda item's attributes (combination of claim 1 and 4). In contrast, Slutsman discloses a participant changing an agenda item's attributes if they so desire. Applicant's representative suggested amending claim 1 to incorporate claim 4's limitations in order to read over the art of record. In addition, the Examiner and Primary Examiner suggested further amending claim 1 to clearly claim that the computer system performs Applicant's determining and changing steps. Both amendments are included in this response.

**Drawings**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicant's formal drawings filed concurrently with the application.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 14, 17, and 21-25 stand objected to because of the informality that the Examiner is unsure of the outcome when Applicant's invention determines not to perform an adjustment step. Claims 4, 11, and 17 have been canceled in this response and, therefore, objections to these claims are moot.

As agreed upon in the telephonic interview, Applicant has removed the word "whether" (included in the determining limitation) in order to resolve this informality, and request removal of the objection to claims 1, 5, 14, and 21-25.

**Claim Rejections - Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103****Richomme in view of Slutsman in view of Nishizawa**

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-18, and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richomme (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0235279, hereinafter "Richomme") in view of Slutsman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,129, hereinafter "Slutsman") and further in view of Nishizawa (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0004734, hereinafter "Nishizawa"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claims 4, 11, and 17 have been canceled in this response and, therefore, rejections to these claims are moot.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 4 and to clarify that a computer system performs the limitations within the claim. As such,

claim 1 as amended includes the limitations directed to dynamically adjusting an agenda using a computer system with limitations comprising:

- receiving a request at the computer system, the request corresponding to a first agenda item from a plurality of agenda items included in the agenda;
- retrieving, by the computer system, one or more first agenda item attributes corresponding to the first agenda item;
- determining, by the computer system, to adjust one or more of the first agenda item attributes based upon the request;
- adjusting, by the computer system, one or more of the first agenda item attributes in response to the determination;
- identifying, by the computer system, a second agenda item from the plurality of agenda items, wherein the second agenda item is subsequent to the first agenda item;
- determining, by the computer system, to change one or more second agenda item attributes corresponding to the second agenda item in response to the adjusting; and
- changing, by the computer system, one or more of the second agenda item attributes in response to determining to change one or more of the second agenda item attributes corresponding to the second agenda.

Applicant's invention adjusts a first agenda item, and then determines to change a second, subsequent agenda item, based upon adjusting the first agenda item. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clearly claim that the adjustment, determination, and changing step are performed by a computer system.

Focusing on the sixth and seventh limitations of claim 1 above, Applicant claims "determining, by the computer system, to change one or more second agenda item attributes corresponding to the second agenda item in response to the adjusting," and "changing, by the computer system, one or more of the second

*agenda item attributes* in response to determining to change one or more of the second agenda item attributes corresponding to the second agenda." The Office Action uses Slutsman to reject claim 1's sixth and seventh limitations. After further review of Slutsman, and agreed upon in the telephonic interview, Slutsman actually discloses that a **participant** chooses to change agenda item attributes if they so desire. Particularly, Slutsman states:

"The conference invitation contains the session-ID identifying the conference and those attributes sent in the conference request which are necessary for the **participants to make a determination** as to whether or not they will be able to "attend" the conference. Upon receipt of the conference invitation, in step 45, the **potential participants can review those attributes and modify them as they see fit.**" (col. 3, lines 19-26, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Slutsman teaches that a participant **himself** determines whether the participant is able to attend a **meeting**, which is different than "*determining, by the computer system, to change one or more second agenda item attributes*" as claimed by Applicant. The above excerpt also states that the participant reviews attributes and modifies **them** as they see fit. As can be seen above, "them" in this case being the same agenda item attributes that the participant received, which is different than "*changing, by the computer system, one or more of the second agenda item attributes*" wherein Applicant's "second agenda item attributes" correspond to a second agenda item that is subsequent to the first agenda item.

The Office does not suggest that Richomme or Nishizawa teach claim 1's sixth or seventh limitations, and indeed

Richomme or Nishizawa do not. Therefore, since Richomme, Slutsman, or Nishizawa do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination with one another, all the limitations included in Applicant's claim 1 as amended, claim 1 is allowable over Richomme in view of Slutsman and further in view of Nishizawa. Claim 8 as amended is an information handling system including the same limitations as amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claim 14 as amended is a computer program product claim including the same limitations as amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 21-22 as amended are method claims including at least the same limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claim 23 as amended is an information handling system including at least the same limitations as amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claims 24-25 as amended are a computer program product claims including at least the same limitations as amended claim 1 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

Each of the remaining claims 2-3, 5, 9-10, 12, 15-16, and 18 each depend, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5, 9-10, 12, 15-16, and 18 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable.

**Richomme in view of Slutsman, Nishizawa and Salesky**

Claims 6-7, 13, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richomme in view of Slutsman in view of Nishizawa and further in view of Salesky (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313, hereinafter "Salesky"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 6 is dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, claim 6 adds a limitation to claim 1 of:

- receiving a subscription request from a participant, the subscription request associated with an entry point that corresponds to the first agenda item, the entry point being an instant in time that the participant is allowed to join a meeting associated with the agenda;
- selecting the first agenda item;
- notifying, at the entry point, the participant in response to the selecting; and
- subscribing, at the entry point, the participant in response to the notifying.

Applicant has amended claim 6 to clearly claim that claim 6's notifying and subscribing limitations are performed at **an entry point**, which is *"an instant in time that the participant is allowed to join a meeting associated with the agenda"* as claimed by Applicant and disclosed by Applicant throughout Applicant's specification (e.g., page 5, lines 7-8).

The Office Action uses Salesky to reject Applicant's notifying and subscribing limitations. After closer review of Salesky, however, Salesky does not wait until an entry point to notify and subscribe a participant, but rather performs these steps immediately. Specifically, when rejecting Applicant's claim 6, the Office Action uses excerpts from Salesky that state:

"The server also handles control messages, such as a request to join a meeting... The server accepts connection requests and verifies that the user of the client software is authorized to join the meeting."  
(col. 18, lines 12-210, emphasis added)

"When a new conferee joins a meeting, the conferee sends his or her personal icon and gong to each other client, via the conference server. The new conferee is then "announced" by the gong." (col. 14, line 65-col.15, line 1, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpts, Salesky never teaches or suggests notifying and subscribing a participant at **an entry point** as claimed by Applicant. The Office Action does not suggest that Richomme, Slutsman, or Nishizawa teach such limitations, and indeed Richomme, Slutsman, or Nishizawa do not.

Therefore, since Richomme, Slutsman, Nishizawa, or Salesky do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination with one another, all the limitations included in Applicant's claim 6 as amended, claim 6 is allowable over Richomme in view of Slutsman in view of Nishizawa and further in view of Salesky. Claim 13 as amended is an information handling system including the same limitations as amended claim 6 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 6 is allowable. Claim 19 as amended is a computer program product claim including the same limitations as amended claim 6 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

Each of the remaining claims 7 and 20 each depend upon allowable independent claims 1 and 14, respectively. Therefore, claims 7 and 20 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable.

**Conclusion**

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicant that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests an early allowance of such claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen Reg. No. 42,196/  
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196  
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone: (512) 301-6738  
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742